

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 15

October 10, 2017

239 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bueno v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 907	31
Gordon v. Gordon (Order), 327 C 904	28
Haughey v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 906	30
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Davis (Order), 327 C 908	32
MYM Realty, LLC v. Doe (Order), 327 C 908	32
Pires v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 907	31
Ramos v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 904	28
Sousa v. Sousa (Order), 327 C 906	30
State v. Andino (Order), 327 C 906	30
State v. Holley (Order), 327 C 907	31
State v. Jones (Order), 327 C 905	29
State v. Pelella, 327 C 1	3
<i>Threatening second degree; appeal by state on granting of permission; first amendment to United States constitution; whether trial court improperly granted motion to dismiss charges; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that law required alleged threat to be imminent for it to constitute true threat; whether trial court improperly viewed evidence before it in light most favorable to defendant in ruling on motion to dismiss; whether issue of whether statement constituted true threat was for jury to decide.</i>	
State v. Toro (Order), 327 C 905	29
Thorpe v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 905	29
Volume 327 Cumulative Table of Cases	33

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Byrd v. Commissioner of Correction, 177 CA 71	73A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that ex post facto law passed after petitioner was sentenced improperly invalidated application of risk reduction credits toward petitioner's parole eligibility date; motion for summary judgment; whether habeas court properly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over habeas petition; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether ex post facto prohibition was implicated where changes to law had no bearing on punishment to which petitioner's criminal conduct exposed him when he committed crime; whether parole eligibility under statute (§ 54-125a) constitutes cognizable liberty interest sufficient to invoke habeas jurisdiction.</i>	
Eder's Appeal from Probate, 177 CA 163	165A
<i>Probate appeal; remainder beneficiaries of irrevocable trust; claim that trial court improperly concluded that settlor's intent in adopting two adult children was not relevant to determination of whether adoptions were sham; claim that trial court erred in holding purpose of trust was not contravened by settlor's adoption of two adult children; whether adults adopted by settlor could be considered natural objects of settlor's bounty; whether adopted children were allowed to take under trust; whether intent of trust is determined from language of trust.</i>	
Diehl v. Powell (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 902	188A
JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Assn. v. Essaghof, 177 CA 144	146A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court's finding that defendants were not fraudulently induced into executing agreement to modify original loan was clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused discretion in rejecting special defense of unclean hands;</i>	

(continued on next page)

	<i>whether trial court properly found that representations were not false; claim that originator of loan had concealed motivation for modification agreement and that defendants were pressured into signing modification agreement; claim that trial court abused discretion by granting motion for equitable relief; whether trial court improperly ordered defendants to reimburse plaintiff for property taxes paid during pending appeal.</i>	
McFarline v. Mickens, 177 CA 83		85A
	<i>Negligence; summary judgment; claim that issues of material fact existed as to whether plaintiff's injury from trip and fall on public sidewalk was caused by negligence of abutting property owner due to defective sidewalk with grass growing wildly through crack; whether abutting landowner owed duty to maintain public sidewalk in reasonably safe condition; whether positive act exception to general rule absolving landowners of liability for defective sidewalks applied; claim that trial court erroneously considered facts outside of record and thereby violated plaintiff's right to due process of law; claim that trial court abused discretion by denying motions to reargue and to amend complaint.</i>	
Pellet v. Keller Williams Realty Corp., 177 CA 42		44A
	<i>Contracts; whether trial court improperly directed verdict in favor of defendants on ground that all counts of complaint were based on breaches of professional standards of care and plaintiff failed to present expert testimony as to applicable standard of care; whether all counts of complaint summarily could be characterized as one general claim of professional negligence; whether court improperly concluded that plaintiff's failure to tender expert witness resulted in lack of evidence on professional standards of care; whether jury had before it testimony from which it could have inferred that standards of care were breached by defendants; whether court improperly granted motions for special finding, pursuant to statute (§ 52-226a), that action was brought without merit and in bad faith.</i>	
Pritsker v. Keating (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 901		187A
Propel Financial 1, LLC v. Ortiz (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 901		187A
Puff v. Puff, 177 CA 103		105A
	<i>Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motions for modification of alimony and contempt; whether trial court erred in concluding that parties' oral agreement was enforceable, binding agreement; claim that trial court improperly modified oral agreement when reducing terms to written decision; whether trial court improperly failed to canvass plaintiff pursuant to statute (§ 46b-66); whether trial court improperly granted motion for contempt; whether plaintiff wilfully violated court order.</i>	
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer, 177 CA 1		3A
	<i>Writ of error; claim that receivership was void because trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over foreclosure action; whether plaintiff in error rebutted presumption that defendant in error, as holder of notes, had standing to commence foreclosure actions; whether trial court improperly granted motions for order of payment with respect to receiver of rents; whether receiver of rents had obligation to collect and account for rents for properties; whether trial court abused discretion</i>	

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, Publications Director

Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 ERIC M. LEVINE, Reporter of Judicial Decisions
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

<i>in denying motions to reargue; whether findings of fact by trial court were clearly erroneous; whether doctrine of judicial estoppel applied to bar claim for order of payment.</i>	
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Spear (See Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer), 177 CA 1	3A
Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. 76–78 Truman Street, LLC (See Seaport Capital Partners, LLC v. Speer), 177 CA 1	3A
State v. Cuadrado (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 901	187A
State v. Redmond, 177 CA 129.	131A
<i>Writ of error; whether trial court improperly ordered forfeiture of seized property pursuant to statute (§ 54-36a [c]); claim that § 54-36a (c) applied only to seized contraband and certain cash linked to illegal drug transactions, and not to firearms; whether trial court's determination that requisite nexus existed between seized firearms and narcotics business of defendant in underlying criminal matter was supported by record; claim that trial court should have conducted in rem forfeiture proceedings pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2013] § 54-33g) in order to effectuate forfeiture of seized firearms; claim that trial court improperly entered forfeiture order without providing plaintiff in error with notice and opportunity to be heard, in violation of in rem forfeiture procedures set forth in § 54-33g; whether § 54-36a (c) requires court or state to provide formal notice to any individual that may have interest in seized property that is to be forfeited; failure of plaintiff in error to file timely motion for return of seized property during pendency of criminal action pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 41-13).</i>	
State v. Taylor, 177 CA 18	20A
<i>Murder; robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; hindering prosecution; tampering with physical evidence; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of murder, robbery in first degree and conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; claim that, because there was no evidence that robbery had occurred, there was no proof of robbery or conspiracy to commit robbery or of murder under doctrine of Pinkerton v. United States (328 U.S. 640); whether trial court abused discretion by granting motion to disqualify defendant's first court-appointed counsel; whether defendant, who was indigent, had right to select appointed counsel; whether it was permissible for court to change appointed counsel when potential conflict of interest existed; whether defendant was prejudiced by disqualification of appointed counsel.</i>	
Volume 177 Cumulative Table of Cases	183A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries	1B
---------------------	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Small Claims Decentralization	1C
---	----